

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the enclosed amendments and remarks is requested. Claims 1-33 remain in the application.

ARGUMENT

Claims 1-11, 13-23, and 25-33 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Schaefer (US 2002/0124252 A1).

The Examiner cites Schaefer as rendering unpatentable claims Schaefer. The patent application for Schaefer was filed on March 2, 2001. The present application was filed on July 20, 2001, but was invented prior to the March 2, 2001 effective date of Schaefer. Accordingly, a Rule 1.131 affidavit is presented herewith to remove Schaefer from consideration as prior art for the present application.

Without Schaefer as a valid prior art reference, the present claims are allowable.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer in view of Omoigui (2005/0086688).

Since Schaefer is not valid prior art, this rejection cannot stand. Claim 12 is allowable as presented.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer in view of Blackketter (2003/0204854).

Since Schaefer is not valid prior art, this rejection cannot stand. Claim 24 is allowable as presented.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Claims 1-33 are all in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 264-8074. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

09/910,574

Respectfully submitted,

s/Steven P. Skabrat/
Senior Attorney
Intel Corporation
Registration No. 36,279
(503) 264-8074

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor &
Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026